- 1 be specific. Let me refer you first to the third page.
- 2 This is a letter dated January 24, 1994.
- 3 A I have it.
- 4 Q Is that your signature on the letter?
- 5 A It is.
- 6 O To whom did you address the letter?
- 7 A To John Booth, the licensee of WRBR.
- 8 Q Why did you write this letter?
- 9 A I wanted to engage the services of Tim Moore,
- 10 Audience Development Group, at WLTA. I was going to do that
- 11 at WLTA as stated in this letter.
- 12 Again, Tim was a broadcaster, had operated radio
- 13 stations, and I felt that he could contribute to the success
- of WRBR, and yet I felt it was not my prerogative to without
 - some kind of authorization from the licensee, Mr. Booth, so
 - 16 I wrote to him and asked if -- urged him rather to engage
 - 17 Mr. Moore for WRBR. That happened in January.
 - 18 Q If you would turn with me to the next page?
 - 19 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Wait a minute. It is not just
 - 20 WRBR, is it? It is also WLTA?
 - THE WITNESS: That's right, but I was asking Mr.
 - 22 Booth's permission.
 - JUDGE CHACHKIN: In the first place, it does not
- do us any good to refer to letters. The letter is not in
- 25 evidence. Nobody is going to know what we are talking

- 1 about.
- 2 If the letter is not read and it is not put in
- 3 evidence, then what in the world are we talking about?
- 4 Someone is going to try to refer to something that was said
- 5 referring to a letter. It means nothing unless we have the
- 6 contents of that letter.
- 7 MR. GUZMAN: Your Honor, I had intended to move
- 8 for the admission of this letter. I can do it now, if you
- 9 would like.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, you are putting on your
- 11 cross-examination. I am just telling you at some point this
- 12 letter has to come in or else the testimony will not mean a
- 13 thing.
- 14 MR. GUZMAN: I move for the admission of
- 15 Pathfinder Exhibit 37, the third page of that exhibit.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: Wait a minute. You are telling
- me it is your intention to put in all these exhibits or any
- 18 portion of these exhibits?
- 19 MR. GUZMAN: The documents that I will be using
- 20 during the cross-examination, I would like to move certain
- 21 of them into evidence, yes.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: I have no problem with that,
- 23 except we are not going to start with No. 37 if there are
- not going to be 37 prior exhibits in evidence.
- The Bureau, I understood, identified the exhibits

- they are going to put in, and presumably they are going to
- 2 put in most of them; not all of the exhibits. They are
- 3 going to attempt to introduce them. How come we are calling
- 4 this 37? What happened to 1 through 36?
- 5 MR. GUZMAN: Your Honor, I appreciate that it is a
- 6 little bit complicated, but --
- 7 JUDGE CHACHKIN: This is your first exhibit. This
- 8 should be Exhibit 1.
- 9 MR. GUZMAN: Your Honor, this is the
- 10 cross-examination. During the Commission's case --
- 11 JUDGE CHACHKIN: It does not matter when. It is
- 12 going to be your first exhibit. If you want to introduce
- it, it should be Exhibit 1 --
- 14 MR. GUZMAN: I understand.
- 15 JUDGE CHACHKIN: -- unless you are willing to say
- 16 you are going to put in all these other exhibits at some
- 17 point.
- 18 MR. GUZMAN: If it is all right with you, Your
- 19 Honor, let's mark this for identification as Pathfinder
- 20 Exhibit 1, and I will move for admission in that way.
- 21 (The document referred to was
- 22 marked for identification as
- Pathfinder Exhibit No. 1.)
- 24 JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. This is a one page
- document dated January 24, 1994, signed by Steve Kline,

| 1 | addressed to John L. Booth, II. Any objection to its | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | receipt in evidence? | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | MR. SHOOK: No, Your Honor. | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. This is Pathfinder | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Exhibit 1? | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | BY MR. GUZMAN: | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Q Let me turn your attention, Mr. Kline, to | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: This is going to be Pathfinder | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Exhibit 1? | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | MR. GUZMAN: Yes, it is, sir. | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: And have you supplied the | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | reporter with two copies of this document? How are we going | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | to handle this? | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | MR. GUZMAN: The reporter has our binders, sir. | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: The binder is not going to do him | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | any good. I do not think he has your document. You have to | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | supply him with two copies of the document. | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | MR. GUZMAN: We can do that, Your Honor. If it is | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | all right with you, perhaps we can do it at the end of | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | today's session; that is, clean up the record and give it to | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | the reporter. | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | |

| 1 | (The document referred to, |
|----|--|
| 2 | having been previously marked |
| 3 | for identification as |
| 4 | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 1, was |
| 5 | received in evidence.) |
| 6 | MR. GUZMAN: Your Honor, if I may? |
| 7 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes. |
| 8 | MR. GUZMAN: The subject of what had been talked |
| 9 | about as the document following No. 47 in Pathfinder's |
| 10 | exhibits is marked for identification as Mass Media Bureau |
| 11 | Exhibit No. 48. |
| 12 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. Obviously there are |
| 13 | already two copies of that in the record. |
| 14 | BY MR. GUZMAN: |
| 15 | Q I would like to refer you, Mr. Kline, to the next |
| 16 | page. That is the fourth page behind Tab 37. |
| 17 | A I have it. |
| 18 | MR. GUZMAN: Let me identify this as Pathfinder |
| 19 | Exhibit 2. |
| 20 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: This is what? This is the letter |
| 21 | from Booth to Kline? |
| 22 | MR. GUZMAN: Correct, dated January 26, 1994. |
| 23 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. The document will be |
| 24 | marked for identification as Pathfinder Exhibit 2. |
| 25 | |

| 1 | (The document referred to was |
|----|--|
| 2 | marked for identification as |
| 3 | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 2.) |
| 4 | BY MR. GUZMAN: |
| 5 | Q Do you recognize this letter, Mr. Kline? |
| 6 | A I do. |
| 7 | Q Can you tell us what it is, please? |
| 8 | A This is a response to my letter of January 24 to |
| 9 | John Booth agreeing that he would like to hire Tim Moore and |
| 10 | the Audience Development Group and that he would |
| 11 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, do not read what it says in |
| 12 | the letter. It is in evidence. We can all read it. If you |
| 13 | can provide some additional information concerning |
| 14 | circumstances of the letter that is one thing, but just to |
| 15 | read portions of the letter does not advance the record. |
| 16 | MR. GUZMAN: Perhaps I could facilitate. |
| 17 | BY MR. GUZMAN: |
| 18 | Q Mr. Kline, you had said earlier that you had |
| 19 | proposed to Mr. Booth that Tim Moore be hired as the program |
| 20 | consultant at WRBR. Is that right? |
| 21 | A Yes. |
| 22 | Q Is this the letter that you received back from Mr. |
| 23 | Booth in response to that proposal? |
| 24 | A Yes, it is. |
| 25 | Q Let me call your attention to the cc down at the |
| | Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888 |

| 1 | bottom of the document. Do you see that? |
|----|---|
| 2 | A I do. |
| 3 | Q It says cc: Vince Ford, V-P/GM, WRBR. As of |
| 4 | January 26, 1994, who was Vince Ford? What was his |
| 5 | function? |
| 6 | A He was the vice-president and general manager of |
| 7 | WRBR. He was there when I got there in October of 1993. |
| 8 | MR. GUZMAN: Your Honor, I move for the admission |
| 9 | of Pathfinder Exhibit 2. |
| 10 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Any objection? |
| 11 | MR. SHOOK: None, Your Honor. |
| 12 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Exhibit 2 is received. |
| 13 | (The document referred to, |
| 14 | having been previously marked |
| 15 | for identification as |
| 16 | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 2, was |
| 17 | received in evidence.) |
| 18 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: You stated that you will give an |
| 19 | original and a copy to the reporter of the exhibits which |
| 20 | you are identifying? |
| 21 | MR. GUZMAN: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 22 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. |
| 23 | BY MR. GUZMAN: |

a program consultant for WRBR, what types of services did he

24

25

Now, as of the time that Tim Moore was hired to be

- 1 provide to that radio station?
- A He did an analysis of format gaps in the market.
- 3 The radio station, at the time that he did the analysis, was
- 4 an oldies radio station, and he was attempting to provide
- 5 some guidance on should that radio station continue as an
- 6 oldies radio station or perhaps consider another format.
- 7 Q Who supervised the activities of Mr. Moore?
- 8 A I did. Mr. Hicks was involved in it. He knew Mr.
- 9 Moore before I did. They were both Michigan broadcasters,
- so I had -- Mr. Moore had the credibility with Mr. Hicks to
- 11 perform.
- We supervised the project. It's something we
- talked about a lot, trying to cement his long term
- 14 association with WRBR and with Mr. Hicks and suggesting
- there were things that he could do as a consultant to
- improve the quality of that radio station; program,
- 17 formatic.
- 18 Q Now, as it relates to Mr. Moore's work for WRBR,
- 19 did Mr. Dille have any involvement in that?
- 20 A No.
- 21 O Was Mr. Moore also a consultant at that same time,
- 22 that is early 1994, for WLTA, the --
- 23 A Yes.
- 25 A Yes, he was.

- 1 Q Tell us how that employment came into being.
- A He has a good reputation as a program consultant.
- 3 He was close. He was in Grand Rapids, and I'm in South
- 4 Bend. He has radio stations all over the country that he
- 5 consults.
- I don't know the specific -- I mean, there's a lot
- of sources of information about the Audience Development
- 8 Group. They advertise in the trades. They're very well
- 9 respected. They participate in national radio seminars.
- 10 It was my intent to hire him as a program
- 11 consultant for WLTA, which was the light AC, in early 1994.
- 12 Q And in fact you did hire Mr. Moore to be a
- 13 consultant for WLTA?
- 14 A I did.
- 15 Q Did there come a time when you stopped using the
- 16 services of Mr. Moore for WLTA?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q Tell us about that, please.
- 19 A It was not pleasant. There was a period of time
- when we had decided to change the format of WLTA to country,
- 21 and that was not an area of format that Mr. Moore had a lot
- 22 of experience in. There was also available a very good
- 23 country program consultant available, and I wanted that
- 24 person to be my consultant at the new country radio station.
- I terminated Mr. Moore's services with WLTA that

- was going to become WBYT, the country station. That was not
- 2 pleasant because we did maintain and continue, and I think
- 3 very successfully, our relationship at WRBR, but I dismissed
- 4 and replaced Mr. Moore at WLTA.
- 5 Q At the time when you stopped using Mr. Moore to
- 6 consult for WLTA, did you make that decision in conjunction
- 7 with Mr. Dille?
- 8 A Mr. Dille was aware of the Rusty Walker Consulting
- 9 Services, and he concurred that Rusty Walker would be the
- 10 best choice for a country radio station.
- 11 Q When you stopped using Mr. Moore for WLTA, you
- knew that he was a long-time colleague and associate of Mr.
- 13 Hicks, did you not?
- 14 A That's correct.
- 15 Q Did Mr. Hicks try to intervene in any way to stop
- 16 you from terminating Mr. Moore at WLTA?
- 17 A No.
- 18 Q Did you worry that you could not terminate Mr.
- 19 Moore with respect to WLTA because of his association with
- 20 Mr. Hicks?
- 21 A No. That had nothing to do with Mr. Hicks.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: That is what I thought. I was
- 23 wondering why you were asking these questions unless we are
- 24 arguing that Mr. Hicks was somehow involved with WLTA.

25

| | 1 | BY MR. GUZMAN: |
|---|----|--|
| | 2 | Q At some point you testified that WRBR changed |
| | 3 | formats and moved from an oldies format to an active rock |
| | 4 | format. If I am correct, you testified that the impetus for |
| | 5 | that change was the Bob and Tom Show. Is that right? |
| | 6 | A The availability of the Bob and Tom Show. Keep in |
| | 7 | mind that prior to during 1995, the Bob and Tom Show was |
| | 8 | in the market, but not on our radio station. We had seen |
| | 9 | the impact that it made in a short period of time on a low |
| | 10 | power, high frequency, AM radio station. |
| | 11 | Dave and I concurred that when it became |
| | 12 | available, or at least if it was not on the air on that |
| | 13 | other radio station, this would give us reason to look at |
| | 14 | our policies on programming. Boy, if we could get that for |
| | 15 | our morning show. |
| | 16 | It worked out good. It was a joint project. Mr. |
| | 17 | Hicks has another Michigan broadcaster who was involved, and |
| | 18 | I'm not sure if he was an agent or a broker or just how he |
| | 19 | was involved with this syndicated show, but he lived in |
| | 20 | Detroit. His name was Rob Ridder. He is the person who was |
| : | 21 | handling the syndication of that program. Mr. Hicks knew |
| : | 22 | him. |
| : | 23 | The general manager of Q95 Radio in Indianapolis, |
| : | 24 | the originating station for Bob and Tom, their primary |
| | | |

employer for the last 12 years had been a general manager

25

- 1 with me in Cincinnati at another radio station back in the
- 2 1970s or in the 1980s, the early 1980s, so we felt we had a
- 3 good network there from two different directions to try to
- 4 get this radio show. We successfully went through the steps
- 5 kind of independent of each other, but with a fruitful
- 6 conclusion.
- 7 You must keep in mind they were just at that time
- 8 trying to syndicate across the country. The originating
- 9 station was anxious to be back on the air in South Bend.
- 10 They did not want that program to be off because other
- 11 prospective radio stations could say what happened in South
- Bend, and why aren't you on the air now? You used to be,
- and now you're gone. They were receptive to my advances,
- and Mr. Hicks was also talking to the syndicator through Mr.
- 15 Ridder.
- 16 Q So you and Mr. Hicks recognized an opportunity to
- 17 get the Bob and Tom Show on your radio station?
- 18 A Exactly.
- 19 Q And you went out and did that?
- 20 A We did that, and that occurred in six or eight
- weeks; less time than it takes to do an inflatable bear. I
- 22 mean, really. It happened quickly because the market had
- been exposed to them for a year or close to it.
- Q Did Mr. Dille have any participation in getting
- 25 the Bob and Tom Show on the air at WRBR?

- 1 A I don't think he knew about it.
- 2 Q Now, the Bob and Tom Show led to a format change
- 3 at WRBR?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q Who was involved in deciding to make that format
- 6 change?
- 7 A Mr. Hicks, of course, and Tim Moore from the
- 8 Audience Development Group, the program director, Joe
- 9 Turner, and myself.
- 10 Q Did Mr. Dille have any involvement in that format
- 11 change?
- 12 A Mr. Dille was not aware of that format change.
- 13 Q Mr. Kline, let me refer you to another document.
- This is in our second binder under Tab 77.
 - 15 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Let me make clear that after
 - 16 today, if you want to introduce any exhibits you will have a
 - copy of the original and a copy for the reporter at that
 - time so he can stamp it and so we have an orderly record.
 - 19 Otherwise we are going to have a big mess. That goes for
 - 20 all parties.
 - MR. GUZMAN: As a point of clarification, Your
 - 22 Honor, at the outset of the proceeding we had exchanged,
 - 23 Hicks Broadcasting had exchanged, materials with the other
 - 24 parties as well.
 - JUDGE CHACHKIN: So you do not have to get copies

- 1 to the other parties, but you do have to have an original
- 2 and a copy for the reporter.
- 3 MR. GUZMAN: We have also given or have two copies
- 4 to give two copies of our exhibits to the court reporter as
- 5 well.
- 6 However, we had misunderstood the import of your
- 7 pre-hearing scheduling Order and had, as you had indicated
- 8 in our hearing back on the 6th, labeled our exhibits
- 9 already.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes, but you have not marked the
- 11 exhibits. You said these are documents which you may or may
- 12 not offer.
- MR. GUZMAN: Correct.
- 14 JUDGE CHACHKIN: In order to have an orderly
- record here, we have to have a chronology starting with 1,
- 16 Exhibit 1.
- MR. GUZMAN: That is why what we propose to do,
- 18 Your Honor, is simply to recapitulate another set of labels,
- 19 use the existing set of documents that we have, and as we
- introduce them simply give the court reporter and the other
- 21 parties a set of labels to relabel the documents.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. My concern is with
- 23 the record that is with the court reporter --
- MR. GUZMAN: Right.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: -- so he has a chance to stamp

- 1 each copy, the original and a copy, so we have an orderly
- 2 record for purposes of review.
- 3 MR. GUZMAN: We will clear it up, Your Honor. I
- 4 apologize for the inconvenience.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. What exhibit do you
- 6 want to look at now?
- 7 MR. GUZMAN: This is behind Tab 77 in our binder.
- 8 Let's identify it as Pathfinder Exhibit No. 3, and it is a
- 9 memo from the Audience Development Group dated January 12,
- 10 1996.
- 11 JUDGE CHACHKIN: The document is marked for
- 12 identification.
- 13 (The document referred to was
- marked for identification as
- Pathfinder Exhibit No. 3.)
- 16 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Go ahead.
- 17 BY MR. GUZMAN:
- 18 O Mr. Kline, take a moment and familiarize yourself
- 19 with this document. Then I will ask you if you have ever
- seen it before and ask you to tell us a little bit about it.
- 21 (Pause.)
- 22 A Yes. This is a review of the state of the
- 23 station, if you will, and programming matters that we sent
- 24 to Steve Kline and Dave Hicks regarding the state of WRBR as
- 25 of January 12, 1996.

| 1 | Now, at the time of this it included a review of | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | the fall, 1995, ratings as indicated. Mr. Moore quite | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | eloquently, as he does in many of his reports, continues on | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | and on and on about the state of the radio station. | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | At this time in January of 1996, Mr. Moore was not | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | aware of our attempts, you know, to perhaps have a new | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | morning show. There's no discussion in here of Bob and Tom, | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | which occurred in March of that year. This is a state of | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | the health of the radio station in its condition as of | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | January, 1996. | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | His conclusion is to improve our oldies position | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | through better implementation and marketing or attack the | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | underside of the adult contemporary culture that existed in | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | South Bend with he refers to it in his term a diet, a light, | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | CHR, contemporary hit radio. | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | He's saying either continue to do the oldies with | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | a little bit more implementation, a better implementation, | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | or you could consider going in between Sunny and WNDU-FM | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | with a different format. | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | MR. GUZMAN: Thank you. | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Your Honor, move for the admission of Pathfinder | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Exhibit No. 3. | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Any objection? | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | MR. SHOOK: None, Your Honor. | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | MR. GUZMAN: Pathfinder Exhibit 3 is received. | | | | | | | | |

| 1 | | (The document referred to, |
|----|------------|---|
| 2 | | having been previously marked |
| 3 | | for identification as |
| 4 | | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 3, was |
| 5 | | received in evidence.) |
| 6 | | MR. GUZMAN: Let's turn to Tab 78, Mr. Kline. |
| 7 | | I would mark this document for identification as |
| 8 | Pathfinder | Exhibit 4, handwritten notes dated February 5, |
| 9 | 1996. | |
| 10 | | JUDGE CHACHKIN: The document will be so marked. |
| 11 | | (The document referred to was |
| 12 | | marked for identification as |
| 13 | | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 4.) |
| 14 | | BY MR. GUZMAN: |
| 15 | Q | Mr. Kline, do you recognize these notes? |
| 16 | A | That's my handwriting. This is a formal note for |
| 17 | me. | |
| 18 | Q | Does this note reflect a meeting that you had? |
| 19 | A | It does. It was held on 2-5-96. |
| 20 | Q | Who attended this meeting? |
| 21 | A | As indicated on the top line, Brad Williams, |
| 22 | general sa | les manager, myself, Dave Hicks and Tim Moore. |
| 23 | Q | What was the subject of this meeting? |
| 24 | A | Further discussion at this time. Now we're a |
| 25 | month late | er down the road, and at this time we have an idea. |
| | | |

- 1 I don't know that we have a contract yet, but we have an
- idea that we're going to have the Bob and Tom Show.
- Then the purpose of this meeting, this would have
- 4 been the initial meeting to talk about what's going to go
- 5 with that? What are we going to do the other 20 hours of
- 6 the day?
- 7 One of the things we considered -- it's written
- 8 down and then crossed out -- is a recommendation that there
- 9 was a possibility from the earlier document regarding that
- 10 diet CHR. We talked about it. We decided no, we're not
- 11 going to do that, again I think because of competitive
- reasons. The two major, major radio stations in the market
- 13 kind of had that mountain to themselves.
- 14 Item 2 there on that page is talking about active
- rock, which again is identified to take us directly towards
- 16 WAOR and WZOW. These were both rock stations in town. They
- 17 would become our competitors. They were not as formidable
- competitors as WNSN and WNDU, more compatible, as I state
- 19 there, with Bob and Tom, and AOR is more vulnerable than
- 20 WNSN.
- MR. GUZMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kline.
- Move for the admission of Pathfinder Exhibit 4.
- 23 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Any objection?
- MR. SHOOK: Both pages on this?
- MR. GUZMAN: Yes.

| 1 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Any objection? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. SHOOK: No objection. |
| 3 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Pathfinder Exhibit 4 is received. |
| 4 | (The document referred to, |
| 5 | having been previously marked |
| 6 | for identification as |
| 7 | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 4, was |
| 8 | received in evidence.) |
| 9 | MR. GUZMAN: Mr. Kline, let me refer you to Tab |
| 10 | 122 in the Pathfinder binder. |
| 11 | Let's identify it as Pathfinder Exhibit No. 5. |
| 12 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: The document is so marked. |
| 13 | (The document referred to was |
| 14 | marked for identification as |
| 15 | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 5.) |
| 16 | BY MR. GUZMAN: |
| 17 | Q Mr. Kline, do you recognize this memo? |
| 18 | A Yes, I do. |
| 19 | Q Who is the author of this memo? |
| 20 | A The program consultant, Tim Moore, of the Audience |
| 21 | Development Group. |
| 22 | Q Who were the recipients of this memo, as indicated |
| 23 | on the memo? |
| 24 | A Myself and Joe Turner, the program director, and |
| 25 | the owner of the station, Dave Hicks. |

| 1 | Q Just in brief, can you tell us what the subject |
|----|---|
| 2 | matter of this memo is? |
| 3 | A Well, I don't have the date of this, but we are |
| 4 | down the road towards the new format. This may even be fine |
| 5 | tuning strategy after the format was introduced, although I |
| 6 | doubt it because it talks on some of the included pages |
| 7 | about the positioning statements that we were going to use, |
| 8 | how we were going to describe ourself on the air. |
| 9 | There's time involved in producing these. We have |
| 10 | to send these out to our voice person that produces these, |
| 11 | so I would assume that this happened prior to March 17, |
| 12 | 1996, but very close to that date. |
| 13 | Q But in any event, this is a memo discussing |
| 14 | possible formats and possible programming changes with |
| 15 | respect to WRBR? |
| 16 | A That's right. |
| 17 | Q Let's shift gears and talk about personnel |
| 18 | practices at WRBR. |
| 19 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: You are not offering this? |
| 20 | MR. GUZMAN: Pardon me. I did intend to offer |
| 21 | this for admission. |
| 22 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Any objection? |
| 23 | MR. SHOOK: No objection, Your Honor. |
| 24 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Pathfinder Exhibit 5 is received. |
| 25 | |

| 1 | (The document referred to, |
|----|---|
| 2 | having been previously marked |
| 3 | for identification as |
| 4 | Pathfinder Exhibit No. 5, was |
| 5 | received in evidence.) |
| 6 | MR. GUZMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 7 | BY MR. GUZMAN: |
| 8 | Q Let's talk about personnel practices at WRBR, Mr. |
| 9 | Kline. Who has the authority to hire and fire employees at |
| 10 | WRBR? |
| 11 | A I do. |
| 12 | Q Do you ever consult with Mr. Hicks relative to |
| 13 | such decisions? |
| 14 | A I do, yes. |
| 15 | Q On what types of decisions might you consult Mr. |
| 16 | Hicks? |
| 17 | A Well, if I'm hiring and it's a lot of money, I'll |
| 18 | always ask him. If it's a termination, it's probably not a |
| 19 | surprise. He would have been aware that this is what I |
| 20 | wanted to do leading up to it. I think I have a lot of |
| 21 | tolerance in those matters, so it is not spontaneous, but I |
| 22 | would consult with Mr. Hicks about that. |
| 23 | Q Has Mr. Hicks ever come to you and given you input |
| 24 | into personnel related matters? |
| 25 | A He has, yes. Bob and Tom, they are employees. |

| 1 ' | That | was | his | idea | from | the | very | beginning. | He | has | made |
|-----|------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|------------|----|-----|------|
|-----|------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|------------|----|-----|------|

- 2 suggestions and recommendations and evaluations of
- 3 employees. It's an ongoing -- it's not a one way street. I
- 4 mean, I'm not just always talking to Mr. Hicks about it. He
- 5 talks to me about it.
- 6 An area that's probably very high profile as you
- 7 discuss things like that would be the sales department
- 8 because he's getting those Friday reports, you know, and
- 9 it's pretty easy for him to see goose eggs, if that's the
- 10 case, on a person's name. He'll ask about it, you know. Is
- 11 this working out as it should?
- 12 Q You mentioned this morning that there were a
- 13 number of employee functions that got consolidated in the
- months after WRBR was purchased by Mr. Hicks. Did Mr. Hicks
- provide you input and suggestions relative to that
- 16 consolidation?
- 17 A He did. We had -- some of those activities were
- 18 very logical and did not require a lot of discussion. We
- 19 did not need two receptionists for one operation of 25
- 20 people. We did not need two office managers. We did not
- 21 need two traffic people. Those are functions that can best
- 22 be efficiently performed by a single person, and, yes, we
- 23 did discuss that.
- 24 JUDGE CHACHKIN: This is for WRBR, 25 employees?
- THE WITNESS: No. No. There's not that many

- 1 employees at WRBR.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: So what are you referring to?
- 3 THE WITNESS: That in the operation, the total
- 4 operation, there would be only 25 employees.
- 5 JUDGE CHACHKIN: What is the total operation?
- 6 Both stations? Is that what you mean?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. WBYT and WRBR.
- BY MR. GUZMAN:
- 9 Q Since the Judge asked that, let's talk about that
- 10 for just a second. In 1994, in early 1994 after Mr. Hicks
- 11 purchased WRBR, how many full-time employees would you say
- 12 worked at WRBR?
- 13 A When?
- 14 Q Let's take April, 1994.
- 15 A Well, April of 1994, 100 percent. I don't know
- 16 whether that figure was eight, nine, ten people -- less than
- 17 a dozen -- that would have worked at WRBR.
- 18 Now, when that acquisition was made, I offered
- 19 position on a temporary basis to everybody who had been
- 20 employed at WRBR, a probation period, if you will, because I
- 21 believe many of those people as employees of Booth had
- 22 accrued benefits which were not our responsibility. I think
- 23 it was like a clean slate for them when they came to work
- 24 for Hicks Broadcasting. They had accrued vacation time or
- 25 retirement benefits.

1 That was all handled before I was general manager at WRBR, so when those people came to work for the radio 2 3 station really the activity didn't change, but on Friday they're at Booth, and on Monday they're still doing their 4 same job, and I'm hiring them temporarily as employees of 5 6 Hicks Broadcasting. As of say late in the year, 1994, how many 7 0 8 full-time employees were there at RBR? Exclusive or shared? Α Let's start with exclusive. 10 0 Four or five. Α 11 12 0 How about if you included the shared employees? There would have been -- well, then we're probably 13 Α back to eight, nine or ten. 14 15 0 With whom were these employees shared? With WLTA. 16 Α Did WRBR ever employ a person by the name of Sarah 17 0 Aerlocker? 18 Α Yes, we did. 19 What was her function at WRBR? 20 0 Α She was in the sales department at one time. 21 22 Now, Sarah Aerlocker is Mr. Dille's daughter? Is that not right? 23 That's correct. 24 Α 25 Q Did there come a time when you terminated Sarah

- 1 Aerlocker?
- 2 A I did.
- 3 Q Why was that?
- 4 A She was missing too much work, and it was a
- 5 position in sales. That was the kind of position where you
- 6 couldn't take that kind of liberty.
- 7 Q Did you consult with Mr. Dille before you made
- 8 that termination?
- 9 A Not before.
- 10 Q How about after?
- 11 A I think I was the second person to tell him about
- 12 it.
- 13 Q This morning we spoke a little bit about the joint
- sales agreement, and there were a lot of questions which
- showed that you were not necessarily in the best position to
- 16 address that whole subject.
- 17 A I'm sorry. I didn't hear.
- 18 Q We discussed the joint sales agreement this
- morning, and it became clear that you were not the best
- 20 person to address that subject.
- 21 A Right.
- 22 Q In your opinion, who is the best person to address
- 23 that subject?
- 24 A The parties to the agreement, the ownership or
- whoever executes that agreement.

| JUDGE CHACHKIN: Was there anyone besides you who |
|--|
| was responsible for implementing the agreement? |
| THE WITNESS: No. The other person that would be |
| involved in the detail of that agreement would be a member |
| of the bookkeeping department, Bob Watson, who would be more |
| familiar with the terms of that agreement. |
| Again, it was a legal definition of a situation |
| that occurred prior to the time I got there. I wasn't too |
| interested in it, knowing that my day to day duties were |
| simply to maximize the revenue for the two entities. |
| BY MR. GUZMAN: |
| Q Let's change topics again and discuss the |
| finances, control of the finances of WRBR. |
| You described for us this morning a budget |
| process. As I understood it, there were essentially three |
| parts to the budget that you put together, all following |
| roughly the same process. Am I right in understanding that |
| you create a revenue budget, an operating budget and a |
| capital budget for WRBR? |
| |

20 A That's correct.

21 Q Now, in the first instance, in what you might call 22 the draft phase, who were the people that worked to put that 23 together?

A Sales staff, WRBR, general sales manager, WRBR, sales consultant, an outside consultant for WRBR, and

- 1 myself. Not Mr. Hicks.
- 2 Q I believe you said that at the point when this
- 3 budget gets taken to that step in the process, you then
- 4 consult Mr. Watson in the business office for some
- 5 assistance. Is that right?
- 6 A Only to do the spreadsheet calculations of what we
- 7 decided we're going to do. It follows a pattern, the
- 8 history of the previous year.
- 9 It is based on an increase of revenue over the
- 10 previous year and historically will follow the same pattern
- of when that's going to occur, so it's a function of the
- office to prepare a 13 column chart that here's what we're
- going to do January through December, and here's what it'll
- 14 be for the year. That is prepared, yes, by the business
- 15 office.
- 16 Q In your view, does the business office have any
- 17 approval or veto authority --
- 18 A Absolutely not.
- 19 Q -- over items in the budget?
- 20 A Absolutely not.
- 21 Q Has the business office or Mr. Watson ever tried
- 22 to exercise such authority?
- 23 A No.
- 24 Q There comes a time when Mr. Hicks participates in
- 25 the process? Is that not right?

| 1 | A Yes. We do Phase 2, which is the expense part of |
|----|---|
| 2 | it, and it is after those two are completed, revenue and |
| 3 | expense, and I've got a good margin. That's when I take it |
| 4 | to Mr. Hicks. |
| 5 | That usually occurs well, I know what we're |
| 6 | going to do in 1999 today. He doesn't. That usually occurs |
| 7 | in December. For 1999, we have not yet prepared our expense |
| 8 | budget |
| 9 | Q Has Mr. Hicks, in his review and approval of the |
| 10 | budgets, ever questioned various line items in them? |
| 11 | A Yes, he does. |
| 12 | Q Has he ever disapproved any items in the budget? |
| 13 | A Well, there's a third budget, the capital expense |
| 14 | budget, and Mr. Hicks has more hands on in fact, 100 |
| 15 | percent of it with that budget, so there have been items |
| 16 | that he has disapproved of there. |
| 17 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Let's take a ten minute recess. |
| 18 | (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.) |
| 19 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: On the record. |

Pathfinder Exhibit No. 6. This is a letter from Dave Hicks to Steve Kline dated July 23, 1995 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, excuse me, but that is a

71, which I would like to mark for identification as

MR. GUZMAN:

20

21

22

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

Thank you, Your Honor.

Before the break, Mr. Kline, we had turned to Tab

- duplicate of a Mass Media Bureau exhibit, which we did, I
- 2 believe --
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: What is it? Tell me the number
- 4 of the Mass Media Bureau.
- 5 MR. BOYCE: I believe it is No. 110. Let me
- 6 check.
- 7 THE WITNESS: That sounds correct.
- JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. We will use the
- 9 Bureau exhibit, which has already been identified.
- 10 BY MR. GUZMAN:
- 11 Q That is Mass Media Bureau Exhibit No. 110. Mr.
- 12 Kline, you received this note from Dave Hicks?
- 13 A That's correct.
- 14 Q Let me turn your attention to the first sentence
- of it. "Congratulations on a money making June for WRBR."
- 16 Could you just describe briefly for us what the
- 17 circumstances were at WRBR in June?
- 18 A Well, this was a letter dated July 23. That means
- 19 by this point in time Mr. Hicks had received his financial
- statements for the month of June, and I know where he goes;
- 21 the first cell on that Excel report. It showed profit. He
- is just acknowledging that in this letter to me.
- 23 Q Now, he goes on to question a number of line items
- 24 from the budget. The first one is to the Associated Press,
- 25 \$600. Tell us what he was questioning there, please.

- 1 A We had had some discussions about that expense,
- the \$600 expense. Although he does congratulate us on a
- 3 good June, he's got some concerns, and he brings them up in
- 4 the same letter.
- 5 We had discussed at that time replacing the
- 6 Associated Press expense of \$600 with another source for our
- 7 news, and so he goes on to state, "I would hope we are
- 8 nearing the end of this."
- 9 That was by contract. We couldn't just
- 10 arbitrarily stop. We had to finish out a contract. We had
- 11 to finish out the expense.
- 12 Q We have already talked about the rent, so I will
- 13 not detain us longer there.
- 14 Let's skip down to Hicks telephone expense, \$157.
 - 15 Just briefly tell us what Mr. Hicks was inquiring about
 - 16 there.
 - 17 A That had to be a department expense because that
 - 18 is light for the total phone expense for that radio station
 - in a month's time. I don't know by looking at this without
- 20 going back to the June financial and finding exactly that
- 21 \$157.
- His question, though, is, "Is this in addition to
- 23 the cellular trade?" We did have cell phones for certain
- 24 employees, and this was in addition to that. This was a
- 25 cash expense on his June financial. I don't know what

- 1 department it would have been.
- 2 Q How did you respond to Mr. Hicks' inquiries about
- 3 line items in the budget?
- 4 A In this letter?
- 5 Q Right.
- 6 A I would have had a phone conversation with him. I
- 7 would not have written to him with an explanation.
- 8 Q Was it unusual, in your experience, to have Mr.
- 9 Hicks be inquiring about various items from the budget?
- 10 A No.
- 11 Q Turn with me, if you would, to Pathfinder Tab 100.
- 12 MR. GUZMAN: Excuse me a moment, Your Honor. I
- think I have confused myself with all these exhibits.
- 14 (Pause.)
 - 15 MR. GUZMAN: I am going to endeavor to do this out
 - of the Mass Media Bureau exhibits. It will make it easier
 - 17 for us all.
 - 18 BY MR. GUZMAN:
 - 19 Q Let me refer you to Mass Media Bureau Exhibit 100.
 - 20 A What volume?
 - 21 O That is Volume 3.
 - 22 A I have it in front of me.
 - Q Okay. Do you see the handwritten numbers at the
 - 24 bottom? If you would turn to page 5, please?
 - 25 A I have it.

- 1 Q Up at the top of that page you see a reference to
- 2 the 1997 capital expenditures budget being reviewed, and
- 3 then there is some discussion of a significant line item,
- 4 one Plymouth Prowler. Do you remember that discussion?
- 5 A Yes, I do.
- 6 O Tell us a little bit about that.
- 7 A Part of my capital expense request for 1997 was
- 8 for \$37,000 to purchase as a signature vehicle for the radio
- 9 station a Plymouth Prowler, which is a hot automobile that
- 10 has a very high profile. It's show business. It would have
- 11 been good for the radio station.
- 12 Q And you proposed that the management of Hicks
- 13 Broadcasting Company purchase that for the radio station?
- 14 A That's right.
 - 15 Q What was their response?
 - 16 A They thought it was too much money.
 - 17 Q Do you have a Plymouth Prowler for WRBR?
 - 18 A No, we do not.
 - 19 Q Let's turn to page 10 in this same tab, Mass Media
 - 20 Bureau Exhibit 100.
 - 21 A I have it.
 - 22 Q I quess the discussion I am looking at is actually
 - 23 at the top of page 11. Well, at the bottom of page 10 and
 - 24 the top of page -- I apologize. Let's go back to the bottom
- 25 of page 10.

- There is some discussion about the Prowler again
- and then this bear that we discussed. As I understood it,
- 3 these were both capital expenditures. The Prowler was
- 4 disapproved. The bear was approved. Who approved these?
- 5 A Dave and the board, I assume.
- 6 O I had referred to the members of Hicks
- 7 Broadcasting as the management of Hicks Broadcasting. Do
- 8 you know who the owners of Hicks Broadcasting are?
- 9 A I do.
- 10 O Who are those?
- 11 A Dave Hicks, Alek Dille, Flint Dille, Sarah
- 12 Aerlocker.
- 13 Q Now, we have discussed just a few examples of Mr.
- 14 Hicks' and the minority shareholders' review and approval or
- disapproval of certain items in the budget. Did Mr. Dille
- 16 ever participate in the RBR budget process in any way?
- 17 A He did not.
- 18 Q Did he ever require expenditures of WRBR funds?
- 19 A Did he ever require?
- 20 Q Right, or suggest to you ideas that would have
- 21 required --
- 22 A Oh, no.
- 23 Q -- the expenditure of WRBR funds.
- 24 A No.
- Q Did Mr. Dille ever attempt to veto WRBR capital

- 1 expenditures?
- 2 A He did not.
- 3 Q I think you testified this morning that as a
- 4 routine matter, you approved the expenditures at WRBR. Is
- 5 that right?
- 6 A That's correct.
- 7 Q Are there categories of items that you feel that
- 8 would require Mr. Hicks' pre-approval?
- 9 A Yes. If they were major, if they were out of
- 10 budget especially, if they were emergency, if they were
- 11 things I had not planned on, I wouldn't make the expenditure
- 12 without asking.
- Q Do you approve the legal bills for Hicks
- 14 Broadcasting?
 - 15 A No.
 - 16 Q How about accounting bills?
 - 17 A No.
 - 18 Q Just one last question. You have been the general
 - manager of WRBR since April of 1994? Is that right?
 - 20 A That's correct.
 - 21 Q During that time, have you ever regarded Mr. Dille
 - 22 as your boss or supervisor?
 - 23 A At WRBR?
 - 24 Q As it relates to WRBR.
 - 25 A No.

| | 1 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Sir, how did you fix April, 1994, |
|-------|----|--|
| | 2 | as the date which you became general manager of WRBR? |
| Arra, | 3 | THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What date? |
| | 4 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: In April, 1994, you claim you |
| | 5 | became general manager of WRBR. What happened on or about |
| | 6 | that date that made you general manager of WRBR? |
| | 7 | THE WITNESS: Well, the stations were not |
| | 8 | co-located, and there was discussion with the owner at that |
| | 9 | time in April about for the convenience and the efficiency |
| 1 | .0 | of the operation to move it. |
| 1 | .1 | There was a lot of planning and construction, |
| 1 | .2 | things necessary to do that, so for the first time I was |
| 1 | .3 | entering into areas that prior to April 1 I would have been |
| 1 | .4 | forbidden to discuss. |
| 1 | .5 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, you have not answered my |
| 1 | .6 | question. Were you appointed by anyone to become general |
| 1 | .7 | manager of WRBR on April 1, 1994? |
| 1 | .8 | THE WITNESS: No. Mr. Hicks was at that time |
| 1 | .9 | because of the newness of the operation, he was there. He |
| 2 | 0 | lived in Kalamazoo, but he was at the radio station. We |
| 2 | 1 | were simply making plans in concert to bring that radio |
| 2 | 2 | station from its physical location about two miles away from |
| 2 | 3 | where we were. |
| 2 | 4 | JUDGE CHACHKIN: Did anyone at any time in an |
| 2 | 5 | official position say in so many words you are general |